

From: Sullivan, Teresa [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 2:53 PM
To: Drakas, Helen [REDACTED]; Martin, George [REDACTED]; alan.diamonstein [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: AY12-13 goals for the President

Dear Helen, George, and Alan:

On November 5, 2012, I sent you a draft of my goals for Academic Year 12-13. These goals were more detailed than I think optimal, but I considered the additional specification an effort to accommodate you. The evaluation committee met in executive session and with me on November 28, and Helen requested a "few days" to send me comments. Helen sent me a revision on February 2, 2013, with a covering note saying that if I did not want to "further refine" the goals by February 8, the goals would be accepted. **I have strong objections to the goals you sent me.** I want to emphasize that I do not object to having goals nor to being evaluated. In fact, I'd like to note that when I came to UVA I asked for a procedure of mutually-agreed upon goals and evaluation.

Mutually Agreed-upon goals. You sent me 65 goals, 22 of which I had never before seen and which no one had previously discussed with me. In several cases where a goal had been discussed, but I had raised an objection, the goal was restated without any rationale or recognition of my concerns. Simply as a factual point of comparison, other flagship university presidents typically have a one-page list of six or seven high-level strategic goals to accomplish within a year.

Micromanagement. Board oversight is ideally at a strategic or policy level. By contrast, most of these goals are operational, some narrowly so, and some reaching three or four levels into the organization. Nine of them require me to set even more goals or develop highly detailed plans. The goals vary widely in other ways. Some of the goals are in fact tasks, and not presidential tasks at that, and at least one states a policy rather than a goal. Some "goals" revisit management decisions I have already made and that are clearly delegated to me by the *Board Manual*.

Timing. There are sixty-five goals for the remaining five months of the academic year. Four of them (three previously undiscussed) require me to prepare and present something at the February Board meeting, for which the posting deadline occurs in less than one week. Another goal, due in March but also not previously discussed with me, requires me to do something that the General Counsel tells me I am not legally authorized to do.

Important goal omitted. You deleted my most urgent goal, which is raising compensation, especially for faculty. On June 10, Helen cited inaction on faculty salaries as a reason to ask for my resignation, even though I had secured a 2% merit raise for the faculty. The retention and hiring of faculty is our greatest challenge, and improving compensation is critical to solving that challenge.

Needed addition. Since my goals were first submitted on November 5, we have been sanctioned by our regional accreditor. The fact that we are on warning affects our ability to complete some of the stated goals. The specific policy foci of the January 15 SACS letter mean that I no longer have a conflict of interest as institutional representative to SACS, and the continuing issues from the SACS action need to be recognized as a high priority for me. The SACS visiting committee will pay close attention to the Board's compliance with its own policies, including the policy requiring my evaluation every 90 days. I am also mindful of their concern about minority control, which is why I am sharing this message with the entire Board.

Impossibility of attainment. Several goals are impossible to achieve, either because of the timeframe for a specific metric, or because of legal restrictions, or because of their extreme unlikelihood given other constraints (e.g., federal budget). The sheer number of goals is close to impossible to achieve, especially with only five months left in the academic year. I am not averse to stretch goals, but I also do not care to be set up to fail.

Given how far apart you and I seem to be on what is appropriate for goals, and given that 90 days have now elapsed since I first submitted goals, I ask to meet with my evaluation committee. I am prepared for that evaluation, using my original goals. In addition, because it is time to begin preparing for academic year 13-14, I propose that my senior leadership team and I begin to work with the Vice Rector on a set of goals for next year.

This week's number one ranking by *Princeton Review* is just one example of how the University of Virginia pursues excellence without sacrificing efficiency. I believe that this ranking results neither from luck nor from slick public relations; instead, it represents the concerted efforts of generations of Board members, faculty, alumni, and students. We can continue to build the University's stature with focused attention to the most important things, and with continued communication among Board members and administration.

Very truly yours,

Teresa A. Sullivan

President

From: Dragas, Helen [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Sullivan, Teresa [REDACTED]; Martin, George [REDACTED]; alan.diamonstein [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: AY12-13 goals for the President

Dear Terry,

The latest draft you reference sought to echo multiple voices -- selected Committee chairs, the three-person working group as formulated under board policy on presidential evaluation, the Board as it spoke at its November meeting and, of course, you -- while still adhering to the decisions reached by the majority. It appears, though, that the divergence in opinions are too significant to be harmonized yet.

Since greater consensus is needed, I've asked the entire Board to address the issues at hand during Executive Session at our upcoming Board meeting.

The overarching goals and supporting benchmarks afford us a starting point. Let's keep working together to find the best solution for U.Va.

Thank you for your continued partnership.

Helen